



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/855,155	05/14/2001	Stephen E. Allen	03109-033001	1126

7590

10/09/2002

WILLIAM E. BOOTH
Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804

EXAMINER

THERKORN, ERNEST G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1723

DATE MAILED: 10/09/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TC-8

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/855155

Applicant(s)

Allen

Examiner

THERKORN

Art Unit

1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sept 16, 2002
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.
- 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 8-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 5
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1723

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(B) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Frechet (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,310). The claims are considered to read on Frechet (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,310). However, if a difference exists between the claims and Frechet (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,310), it would reside in optimizing the elements of Frechet (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,310). It would have been obvious to optimize the elements of Frechet (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,310) to enhance separation.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frechet (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,310) in view of Hatch (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,565). At best, the claim differs from Frechet (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,310) in reciting the monolith is preformed. Hatch (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,565) (column 8, line 62-65) discloses that a monolith may be polymerized in situ within a tube or formed outside a tube and then inserted by any suitable means. It would have been obvious to use a preformed monolith in Frechet (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,310) because Hatch

Art Unit: 1723

(U.S. Patent No. 6,238,565) (column 8, line 62-65) discloses that a monolith may be polymerized in situ within a tube or formed outside a tube and then inserted by any suitable means.


Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over each of Leavesley (U.S. Patent No. 5,601,708), McDonald (U.S. Patent No. 4,250,035), and Conroy (WO 97/43024) in view of either Frechet (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,310) or Hatch (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,565). At best, the claims differ from each of Leavesley (U.S. Patent No. 5,601,708), McDonald (U.S. Patent No. 4,250,035), and Conroy (WO 97/43024) in reciting use of a monolith inside the vessel. Frechet (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,310) (column 3, lines 51-57) discloses that monoliths have the advantages of compactness, a very high permeability ratio, and very high column efficiency relative to a packed column. Hatch (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,565) (column 4, lines 15-30) discloses that monoliths have the advantages of ease of manufacture, lack of bead shifting, and at least 58% better resolution relative to a packed column. It would have been obvious to use a monolith in each of Leavesley (U.S. Patent No. 5,601,708), McDonald (U.S. Patent No. 4,250,035), and Conroy (WO 97/43024) either because Frechet (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,310) (column 3, lines 51-57) discloses that monoliths have the advantages of compactness, a very high permeability ratio, and very high column efficiency relative to a packed column or because Hatch (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,565) (column 4, lines 15-30) discloses that monoliths have the advantages of ease of manufacture, lack of bead shifting, and at least 58% better resolution relative to a packed column.

Art Unit: 1723

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over each of Leavesley (U.S. Patent No. 5,601,708), McDonald (U.S. Patent No. 4,250,035), and Conroy (WO 97/43024) in view of either Frechet (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,310) or Hatch (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,565) as applied to claims 1-7 above, and further in view of Hatch (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,565). At best, the claim differs from each of Leavesley (U.S. Patent No. 5,601,708), McDonald (U.S. Patent No. 4,250,035), and Conroy (WO 97/43024) in view of either Frechet (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,310) or Hatch (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,565) in reciting the monolith is preformed. Hatch (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,565) (column 8, line 62-65) discloses that a monolith may be polymerized in situ within a tube or formed outside a tube and then inserted by any suitable means. It would have been obvious to use a preformed monolith in each of Leavesley (U.S. Patent No. 5,601,708), McDonald (U.S. Patent No. 4,250,035), and Conroy (WO 97/43024) in view of either Frechet (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,310) or Hatch (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,565) because Hatch (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,565) (column 8, line 62-65) discloses that a monolith may be polymerized in situ within a tube or formed outside a tube and then inserted by any suitable means.

The restriction requirement has been reconsidered, deemed proper, and made final for the reasons of record.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to E. Therkorn at telephone number (703) 308-0362.


Ernest G. Therkorn
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1723

EGT/12
September 30, 2002